



UNIVERSITY
OF TASMANIA

**USING THE MUCOSAL RESPONSE TO
RECOMBINANT *Neoparamoeba perurans*
ATTACHMENT PROTEINS TO DESIGN
AN EXPERIMENTAL VACCINE AGAINST
AMOEBIC GILL DISEASE (AGD)**

by

Victoria Andrea Carolina Valdenegro Vega

Bachelor of Veterinary Science (Hons)

Master of Applied Science (Aquaculture)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies

University of Tasmania

Launceston, Tasmania

November 2014

APPROVALS

Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation

Mucosal immune responses to *Neoparamoeba perurans*

By Victoria A.C. Valdenegro Vega

BVetSc (Hons), MAppSc (Aquaculture)

Supervisor: _____

Professor Barbara F. Nowak

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by the University or any other institution, except by way of background information and duly acknowledged in the thesis, and to the best of the my knowledge and belief no material previously published or written by another person except where due acknowledgement is made in the text of the thesis, nor does the thesis contain any material that infringes copyright.

(signature)

(date)

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

This thesis is not to be made available for loan or copying for two years following the date this statement was signed. Following that time the thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968.

(signature)

(date)

STATEMENT REGARDING PUBLISHED WORK

The publishers of the papers comprising Chapters 2 to 6, inclusive, hold the copyright for that content, and access to the material should be sought from the respective journals. The remaining non published content of the thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying and communication in accordance with the above Statement of Access and the Copyright Act 1968.

Due to the inclusion of published material there is unavoidable repetition of material between Chapters in this thesis.

(signature)

(date)

STATEMENT OF ETHICAL CONDUCT

The research associated with this thesis abides by the international and Australian codes on human and animal experimentation, the guidelines by the Australian Government's Office of the Gene Technology Regulator and the rulings of the Safety, Ethics and Institutional Biosafety Committees of the University.

(signature)

(date)

CO-AUTHORSHIP

The following people and institutions contributed to the publication of work undertaken as part of this thesis:

Victoria A. Valdenegro-Vega (VAV), NCMCRS, University of Tasmania

Barbara F. Nowak (BFN), NCMCRS, University of Tasmania

Philip B. Crosbie (PBC), NCMCRS, University of Tasmania

Mathew T. Cook (MTC), CSIRO, Agriculture Flagship

Benita N. Vincent (BNV), NCMCRS, University of Tasmania

Kenneth D. Cain (KDC), Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, University of Idaho

Andrew R. Bridle (ARB), NCMCRS, University of Tasmania

Melanie J. Leef (MJL), NCMCRS, University of Tasmania

Mark Polinski (MP), NCMCRS, University of Tasmania

Richard Wilson (RW), Central Science Laboratory, University of Tasmania

We the undersigned agree with the stated proportion of work undertaken for each of the published peer-reviewed manuscripts contributing to this thesis.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Professor Barbara Nowak

Supervisor

Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, Launceston

University of Tasmania

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Associate Professor John Purser

Deputy Director, Fisheries and Aquaculture

Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, Launceston

University of Tasmania

Contribution of work by co-authors for each paper:

PAPER 1: Located in Chapter 2

VALDENEGRO-VEGA, V. A., CROSBIE, P. B., POLINSKI, M., LEEF, M.J., BRIDLE, A.R., NOWAK, B.F. (2014). Effects of immunostimulants and repeated infections with Amoebic Gill Disease on antibody levels and immune gene expression in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Fish and Shellfish Immunology (Submitted).

Authors' Contributions:

Conceived and designed the experiments: VAV, PBC, ARB, MJL, BFN

Performed the experiments: VAV, PBC, MP, MJL, ARB

Analysed the data: VAV, PBC, MP, MJL, BFN

Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: MJL, BFN

Wrote the manuscript: VAV, PBC, MP, ARB, BFN

PAPER 2: Located in Chapter 3

VALDENEGRO-VEGA, V. A., CROSBIE, P. B., VINCENT, B.N, CAIN, K. D., NOWAK, B.F. (2013). Effect of immunisation route on mucosal and systemic immune response in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology 151, 113-123.

Authors' Contributions:

Conceived and designed the experiments: VAV, PBC, KDC, BFN

Performed the experiments: VAV, PBC, BNV

Analysed the data: VAV, PBC, BNV, BFN

Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: BFN

Wrote the manuscript: VAV, PBC, BNV, KDC, BFN

PAPER 3: Located in Chapter 4

VALDENEGRO-VEGA, V. A., CROSBIE, P. B., COOK, M.T., VINCENT, B.N., NOWAK, B.F. (2014). Administration of recombinant attachment protein (*r22C03*) of *Neoparamoeba perurans* induces humoral immune response against the parasite in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Fish and Shellfish Immunology 38, 294-302.

Authors' Contributions:

Conceived and designed the experiments: VAV, PBC, MTC, BNV, BFN

Performed the experiments: VAV, PBC, MTC

Analysed the data: VAV, PBC, BNV

Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: MTC, BFN

Wrote the manuscript: VAV, PBC, MTC, BNV, BFN

PAPER 4: Located in Chapter 5

VALDENEGRO-VEGA, V. A., COOK, M.T., CROSBIE, P. B., BRIDLE, A.R., NOWAK, B.F. (2014). Recombinant protein (*r22C03*), a putative attachment factor of *Neoparamoeba perurans*, as a candidate vaccine against AGD in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Fish and Shellfish Immunology (Submitted).

Authors' Contributions:

Conceived and designed the experiments: VAV, PBC, MTC, ARB, BFN

Performed the experiments: VAV, PBC, ARB

Analysed the data: VAV, PBC, ARB

Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: MTC, BFN

Wrote the manuscript: VAV, PBC, MTC, ARB, BFN

PAPER 5: Located in Chapter 6

VALDENEGRO-VEGA, V. A., CROSBIE, P. B., BRIDLE, A.R., LEEF, M., WILSON, R., NOWAK, B.F. (2014). Differentially expressed proteins in gill and skin mucus of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) affected by amoebic gill disease. Short communication. Fish and Shellfish Immunology 40, 69-77.

Authors' Contributions:

Conceived and designed the experiments: VAV, PBC, ARB, MJL, RW, BFN

Performed the experiments: VAV, PBC, ARB, MJL, RW

Analysed the data: VAV, ARB, RW

Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: MJL, RW, BFN

Wrote the manuscript: VAV, PBC, ARB, RW, BFN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who were directly and indirectly involved in this project and that I wish to express my gratitude to.

First and foremost, I am deeply indebted to my supervisory team for helping me complete my dream of becoming a PhD, in particular Prof. Barbara Nowak and Dr Phil Crosbie. Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to be part of this project. Without your constant support, insightful discussions, advice and dedication I would have not been able to complete this immense task. I would also like to thank my co-supervisor Dr Benita Vincent for her patience, her valuable teachings and time spent in the laboratory comforting an unexperienced and sometimes nervous student. To Dr Mathew Cook, for his technical advice and invaluable provision of materials to undertake important part of this research.

I would like to thank the Seafood CRC for my scholarship and acknowledge the different sources of funding that made travel expenses possible to present this work at different conferences and workshops: Fisheries Society of the British Isles Travel Grant, ARC/NHMRC Research Network for Parasitology travel award and the University of Tasmania Post-graduate Conference and Research Travel Fund.

To the members of the Aquatic Animal Health group at the University of Tasmania, in Launceston, Dr Melanie Leef, Dr Andrew Bridle and Ms Karine Cadoret, I express my gratitude for your advice and expertise in laboratory techniques and troubleshooting; and your permanent motivation when things did not look all that positive. I would also like to thank Dr Mark Adams, for lending a helping hand every time technical issues related to fish husbandry occurred.

To my co-authors Dr Kenneth Cain and Dr Richard Wilson, thank you for being part of this work and for your expert advice in mucosal immunology (Ken) and liquid chromatography and proteomics analyses (Richard).

To my fellow PhD candidates and friends Deb, Kaeden, Dan, Catarina, Anna, Rebecca, Max, Mark, Leanne, Ylenia, Gianluca, Megan, Bikram and Ash for being willing listeners of all my complaints, for your help with work and for all those BBQs and desserts which made this journey a lot easier and were so thoroughly

Acknowledgements

enjoyed. To the “Latin girls” Carmen, Laura, Bel and Marian, for those weekly gatherings and long talks in Spanish that made me feel a bit closer to home and added some “spice” to my Australian life.

To my Australian family, Glenda, Grant, Brady, Lauren and Lucas, I thank you for all your love and support. To my parents Hernan and Sara, for believing in me and encouraging me to be the best in everything I wanted to do. To my sisters, nephew and niece, Vero, Vivi, Nico and Flo, thank you for being there for me during those extended Skype talks, for your visits and constant support that helped me go through the difficult moments. I love you all very much.

And finally to my dearest husband James, for offering me your incredible emotional support, your unconditional help during the weekends at the University, your endless patience and love, and just for being as kind as you are. Te amo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVALS	iii
STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY	iv
STATEMENT OF ACCESS	iv
STATEMENT REGARDING PUBLISHED WORK.....	v
STATEMENT OF ETHICAL CONDUCT.....	v
CO-AUTHORSHIP	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xxvi
ABBREVIATIONS	xxviii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xxx
CHAPTER 1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 SALMONID AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY IN TASMANIA	2
1.2 DISEASES AFFECTING SALMON CULTURE IN TASMANIA	4
1.3 AMOEBIC GILL DISEASE.....	5
1.4 IMMUNE SYSTEM OF TELEOSTS.....	8
1.5 IMMUNE RESPONSES AGAINST <i>Neoparamoeba perurans</i>	14
1.6 STUDY OF MUCOSAL CONSTITUENTS IN FISH AFFECTED BY AGD	16
1.7 PREVIOUS VACCINATION APPROACHES AGAINST AGD	18
1.8 AIMS AND THESIS STRUCTURE	24
CHAPTER 2. EFFECTS OF IMMUNOSTIMULANTS AND REPEATED INFECTIONS WITH AMOEBIC GILL DISEASE ON ANTIBODY LEVELS AND IMMUNE GENE EXPRESSION IN ATLANTIC SALMON (<i>Salmo salar</i>) .	26
2.1 ABSTRACT.....	27
2.2 INTRODUCTION	27
2.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	30

Table of Contents

2.3.1	Effects of repeated AGD exposure on antibody levels and transcription.....	30
2.3.2	Effects of immunostimulatory diets on antibody responses to AGD...	31
2.3.3	Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA).....	33
2.3.4	Gene Expression.....	34
2.3.5	Statistical analyses	36
2.4	RESULTS	37
2.4.1	Effects of repeated AGD infection on antibody levels and transcription.....	37
2.4.2	Effects of immunostimulatory diets on antibody responses to AGD...	41
2.5	DISCUSSION	46
2.6	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	51
CHAPTER 3. EFFECT OF IMMUNISATION ROUTE ON MUCOSAL AND SYSTEMIC IMMUNE RESPONSE IN ATLANTIC SALMON (<i>Salmo salar</i>).....		52
3.1	ABSTRACT.....	53
3.2	INTRODUCTION	53
3.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	55
3.3.1	Fish.....	55
3.3.2	Antigen.....	56
3.3.3	Treatments.....	57
3.3.4	Serum and cutaneous mucus sampling	58
3.3.5	Tissue explants and supernatant.....	59
3.3.6	ELISA	59
3.3.7	Western blot (WB) against FITC and DNP haptens and chemiluminescent detection	62
3.3.8	Statistical analysis	63
3.4	RESULTS	63
3.4.1	Anti-FITC serum antibodies in ELISA	63
3.4.2	Anti-FITC mucus antibodies in ELISA	65
3.4.3	Anti-FITC tissue supernatant antibodies in ELISA	67

Table of Contents

3.4.4	Anti-DNP serum antibodies in ELISA.....	69
3.4.5	Anti-DNP mucus antibodies in ELISA.....	71
3.4.6	Anti-DNP tissue supernatant antibodies in ELISA.....	72
3.4.7	WB against antigens.....	73
3.5	DISCUSSION	75
3.5.1	Systemic antibody production.....	75
3.5.2	Mucosal antibody production.....	76
3.5.3	Tissue explants	78
3.6	CONCLUDING REMARKS	80
3.7	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	80
CHAPTER 4. ADMINISTRATION OF RECOMBINANT ATTACHMENT PROTEIN (<i>r22C03</i>) OF <i>Neoparamoeba perurans</i> INDUCES HUMORAL IMMUNE RESPONSE AGAINST THE PARASITE IN ATLANTIC SALMON (<i>Salmo salar</i>)		81
4.1	ABSTRACT.....	82
4.2	INTRODUCTION	82
4.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	84
4.3.1	<i>N. perurans</i> trophozoites.....	84
4.3.2	Identification and molecular analyses of attachment proteins in <i>N.</i> <i>perurans</i>	84
4.3.3	DNA cloning, sequencing and construction of the expression vector .	85
4.3.4	Expression and purification of a soluble recombinant 22C03 fusion protein (<i>r22C03</i>)	85
4.3.5	Experimental animals and treatment.....	86
4.3.6	Serum and cutaneous mucus sampling	87
4.3.7	<i>N. perurans</i> antigen.....	87
4.3.8	Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA).....	88
4.3.9	Western blot, dot blot and chemiluminescent detection	89
4.3.10	Sodium periodate oxidation of WB.....	91
4.3.11	Immunocytochemistry.....	91

Table of Contents

4.3.12	Statistical analysis	91
4.4	RESULTS	92
4.4.1	Protein sequence.....	92
4.4.2	Expression and purification of a soluble <i>r22C03</i> protein by using <i>E. coli</i> expression system.....	93
4.4.3	<i>N. perurans</i> antigens	95
4.4.4	Systemic and mucosal antibody levels against <i>r22C03</i>	96
4.4.5	Systemic and mucosal antibody levels against <i>N. perurans</i> antigens..	98
4.4.6	WB and dot blots.....	100
4.4.7	Immunocytochemistry.....	104
4.5	DISCUSSION	106
4.6	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	109
CHAPTER 5. VACCINATION WITH RECOMBINANT PROTEIN (<i>r22C03</i>), A PUTATIVE ATTACHMENT FACTOR OF <i>Neoparamoeba perurans</i> , AGAINST AGD IN ATLANTIC SALMON (<i>Salmo salar</i>) AND IMPLICATIONS OF A CO-INFECTION WITH <i>Yersinia ruckeri</i>		110
5.1	ABSTRACT.....	111
5.2	INTRODUCTION	112
5.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	114
5.3.1	Fish.....	114
5.3.2	Immunisation	115
5.3.3	<i>N. perurans</i> challenge	116
5.3.4	Sampling procedure	118
5.3.5	Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA).....	118
5.3.6	Assessment of intensity of AGD infection.....	120
5.3.7	Analysis of samples for co-infection	120
5.3.8	Statistical analyses	122
5.4	RESULTS	122

Table of Contents

5.4.1	<i>r22C03</i> was able to induce systemic and mucosal antibody responses in both vaccination groups, but at different times before and after challenge	122
5.4.2	Vaccination did not affect survival time of AGD-challenged fish	127
5.4.3	Vaccination did not have an effect on intensity of AGD infection....	129
5.4.4	Concurrent infection during AGD challenge and <i>Y. ruckeri</i> detection	131
5.5	DISCUSSION	134
5.6	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	139
CHAPTER 6. DIFFERENTIALLY EXPRESSED PROTEINS IN GILL AND SKIN MUCUS OF ATLANTIC SALMON (<i>Salmo salar</i>) AFFECTED BY AMOEBIC GILL DISEASE.....		140
6.1	ABSTRACT	141
6.2	INTRODUCTION	141
6.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	144
6.3.1	Fish and experimental procedures.....	144
6.3.2	Sampling procedures	144
6.3.3	Mucus preparation for proteomics	145
6.3.4	nanoLiquid Chromatography-LTQ-Orbitrap Tandem mass spectrometry.	146
6.3.5	Database searching and criteria for protein identification	146
6.3.6	Statistical analyses	147
6.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	148
6.5	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	165
CHAPTER 7. GENERAL DISCUSSION		166
7.1	INTERPRETING THE ANTIBODY RESPONSES TO DIFFERENT ANTIGENS AND <i>N. perurans</i> IN ATLANTIC SALMON.....	167
7.2	ARE ANTIBODY RESPONSES THE BEST METHOD TO TEST FOR VACCINE EFFICIENCY AND AGD PROTECTION?.....	172
7.3	OTHER CONSIDERATIONS WHEN TESTING VACCINES	176
REFERENCES		181

Table of Contents

APPENDICES	200
APPENDIX 1: OTHER MANUSCRIPTS PUBLISHED DURING PhD	200
APPENDIX 2: CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS.....	201

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.1 Percentage of Australian aquaculture production 2011–12, for total production in weight (A) and for total production value (B). Modified from [4]. _ 2
- Figure 2.1 Antibody (IgM) levels (units) in plasma and IgM levels in skin mucus and gill mucus corrected by the level of mucus protein, from Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) from experiment 1, which tested the effects of repeated AGD infection. Dots (•) represent fish which have not been affected by AGD (n=19) while squares (■) represent fish that have been subjected to four consecutive challenges with the disease (n=24) for a total period of 18 weeks. Dots/squares indicate individual values and bars represent group means. _____ 38
- Figure 2.2 Quantitative RT-PCR analysis of immune-related gene expression in gill of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) from experiment 1, which tested the effects of repeated AGD infection. Three different gill samples were analysed: gills from non-AGD affected salmon (n=10-19) and from AGD-affected salmon in areas with no apparent lesion (n=13-22) or with typical AGD lesion (n=10-22). Bars represent mean values (+S.E.). Different letters represent significant differences by one-way ANOVA ($P<0.05$). _____ 40
- Figure 2.3 Antibody (IgM) levels (units) in serum and skin mucus of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) from experiment 2, which tested the effects of immunostimulatory diets on responses to AGD. Bars represent mean (n=12 for each group). _____ 42
- Figure 2.4 Quantitative RT-PCR analysis of immune-related gene expression in gill of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) from experiment 2, which tested the effects of immunostimulatory diets on responses to AGD. Diet A represents a commercial formulation and diets B and C incorporated immunostimulants. Three different gill samples were analysed: gill from non-AGD affected salmon and from AGD-affected salmon in areas with no apparent lesion or with typical AGD lesion (n=15-21 for each gill area). Bars represent mean values (+S.E.) Different letters represent significant differences by one-way ANOVA ($P<0.05$). _____ 45
- Figure 3.1. Antibody levels (units) present in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) serum, against FITC measured by ELISA. Serum dilution was 1:100. Treatment groups

and controls were immunised as explained in Table 3.1 with fluorescein isothiocyanate conjugated with keyhole limpet haemocyanin (FITC). (◆) FITC-IP; (◇) PBS-IP; (■) FITC-PA; (□) PBS-PA; (▲) FITC-GILLS; (△) PBS-GILLS. Significant differences ($P<0.05$) are reported between each treatment and its control group (*) or among FITC treatments (a,b) at each time point. ____ 64

Figure 3.2. Mucus antibody levels (units) per mg of protein present in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) mucus, against FITC measured by ELISA. Mucus dilution was 1:1. Treatment groups and controls were immunised as explained in Table 3.2 with fluorescein isothiocyanate conjugated with keyhole limpet haemocyanin (FITC). (◆) FITC-IP; (◇) PBS-IP; (■) FITC-PA; (□) PBS-PA; (▲) FITC-GILLS; (△) PBS-GILLS. Significant differences ($P<0.05$) are reported between each treatment and its control group (*) or among FITC treatments (a,b) at each time point. _____ 66

Figure 3.3. Antibody levels (units) present in supernatant from tissue explants obtained from Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) against FITC, measured by ELISA. Supernatant dilution was 1:5. Fish were immunised as explained in Table 3.2 with fluorescein isothiocyanate conjugated with keyhole limpet haemocyanin (FITC) 8 and 12 weeks before obtaining the samples. Tissues were excised and incubated for 72 h in L-15 media supplemented with 10% bovine foetal serum, 2 x PSN antibiotic mix and 1 x GlutamaxTM. Significant differences ($P<0.05$) are reported between each treatment and its control group (*) or among treatments (a,b) for each tissue. _____ 68

Figure 3.4. Antibody levels (units) present in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) serum, against DNP measured by ELISA. Serum dilution was 1:100. Fish were immunised as explained in Table 3.2 with dinitrophenol conjugated with keyhole limpet haemocyanin (DNP). (◆) DNP-IP; (◇) PBS-IP; (■) DNP-PA; (□) PBS-PA; (▲) DNP-GILLS; (△) PBS-GILLS. Significant differences ($P<0.05$) are reported between each treatment and its control group (*) or among DNP treatments (a,b) at each time point. _____ 70

Figure 3.5 Mucus antibody levels (units) per mg of protein present in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) mucus, against DNP measured by ELISA. Serum dilution was

1:1. Fish were immunised as explained in Table 3.2 with dinitrophenol conjugated with keyhole limpet haemocyanin (DNP). (◆) DNP-IP; (◇) PBS-IP; (■) DNP-PA; (□) PBS-PA; (▲) DNP-GILLS; (△) PBS-GILLS. Significant differences ($P<0.05$) are reported between each treatment and its control group (*) or among DNP treatments (a,b) at each time point. _____ 71

Figure 3.6 Antibody levels (units) present in supernatant from tissue explants obtained from Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) against DNP, measured by ELISA. Supernatant dilution was 1:5. Fish were immunised as explained in Table 3.2 with dinitrophenol conjugated with keyhole limpet haemocyanin (DNP) 8 and 12 weeks before obtaining the samples. Tissues were excised and incubated for 72 h in L-15 media supplemented with 10% bovine foetal serum, 2 x PSN antibiotic mix and 1 x GlutamaxTM. Significant differences ($P<0.05$) are reported between each treatment and its control group (*) or among treatments (a,b) for each tissue. _____ 72

Figure 3.7. Western blot showing reactivity of pooled samples of serum, mucus and tissue supernatants from fish i.p. injected 8 and 12 weeks prior with FITC-KLH against FITC-BSA (A, black arrow head) and BSA only (B). Positive and negative samples tested via ELISA were used. Lanes 1 positive serum, lanes 2 negative serum, lanes 3 positive mucus, lanes 4 negative mucus, lanes 5 positive skin supernatant (purified IgM), lanes 6 culture media only (L-15 media, 1 x GlutamaxTM and 1 x PSN antibiotic mix) and lanes 7 PBS only. Blots were then probed with mouse anti-salmon IgM mAb at 1:500 and with goat anti-mouse IgG. All samples were electrophoresed under non-reducing conditions. The white arrow head represents mix of native and modified native forms that forms after BSA is heated. _____ 74

Figure 4.1 Amino acid sequence of recombinant fusion protein r22C03. Underlined residues from 2 to 98 represent homology to a Thioredoxin-like fold. Residues in bold represent the C-type lectin carbohydrate recognition domain (residues 78-213). The # above residues 185, 189, 191, 194, 196-99 and 202-204 indicates conserved carbohydrate ligand binding sites. _____ 93

List of Figures

- Figure 4.2 Recombinant fusion protein *r22C03* (arrow) solubilised from inclusion bodies and purified using a Ni-NTA Resin. In silver stained SDS-PAGE, the original solubilised *r22C03* before the purification with the Ni-NTA resin could be observed (2), as well as the fraction that did not bind to the resin (3). Eluates after a 20mM imidazole wash (4), 50 mM imidazole wash (5) 100 mM imidazole wash (6) and 200 mM imidazole wash (7) are shown. The last three eluates (5, 6 and 7) were pooled and used as the final purified protein. Molecular weight markers are shown in (1). _____ 94
- Figure 4.3 Silver stained SDS-PAGE gel of *Neoparamoeba perurans* protein lysate. Proteins were obtained through freezing and sonication, run on a 10% SDS-PAGE gel and visualised using silver staining. Reduced (1) and non-reduced (2) antigens are shown. M: molecular weight markers. _____ 95
- Figure 4.4 Antibody levels (units) against *r22C03* in serum (A) or per gram of protein in skin mucus (B) of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Fish were immunised initially with *r22C03* and given a booster immunisation 4 weeks after. Antibody levels were measured by ELISA. Groups labelled with different letters are significantly different of one another by one-way ANOVA ($P<0.05$). 97
- Figure 4.5 Antibody levels (units) against antigens of *Neoparamoeba perurans* in serum (A) or per gram of protein in skin mucus (B) of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Fish were immunised initially with *r22C03* and given a booster immunisation 4 weeks after. Antibody levels were measured by ELISA. Groups labelled with different letters are significantly different of one another by one-way ANOVA ($P<0.05$). _____ 99
- Figure 4.6 Binding of serum antibodies from fish immunised with *r22C03* produced distinctly different profiles against the recombinant protein and the whole *Neoparamoeba perurans* antigens. (A) Anti-*r22C03* antibodies in pooled serum of fish immunised 8, 10 and 12 weeks prior with *r22C03* (n=4-5), reacted to a band of approximately 17 kDa (lanes 2, 3, and 4), but not pooled serum of fish before immunisation (lane 1, n=5). (B) In contrast, binding of serum antibodies of fish immunised with *r22C03* 8, 10 and 12 weeks prior to sampling (n=4-5), produced a smear across a broad molecular range against amoebae antigens

(lanes 6, 7 and 8 respectively). Serum obtained from fish before immunisation with *r22C03* did not react against *N. perurans* antigens (lane 5, n=5). Fish were held in freshwater and therefore were AGD-naïve. (C) Sera from fish injected with FCA followed by a booster with FIA 5 weeks later did not show antibody binding to *r22C03* (n=4), but antibodies from these samples did bind to FCA antigen. (+) control was a blot of serum detected only with the secondary antibody. (-) control blot of PBS only probed with samples and secondary antibody. _____ 101

Figure 4.7 Binding of skin mucus antibodies from fish immunised with *r22C03* was strong against the recombinant protein but very weak against the whole *Neoparamoeba perurans* antigens. Anti-*r22C03* antibodies in skin mucus of fish immunised with the recombinant protein 4 weeks prior to sampling, reacted to a blot of recombinant protein *r22C03*, but only very weakly to the blot containing *N. perurans* antigens, these fish had showed the highest absorbance through ELISA. In contrast, skin mucus from fish before immunisation (Week 0) did not react against the recombinant protein *r22C03* or to *N. perurans* antigens. A negative control blotted and probed only with PBS was included. Antigens were diluted in PBS and applied to PVDF membranes. Diluted serum ((+) Control) was applied to the membrane as a positive control to test the secondary mAb; additionally a negative control which was only a PBS blot was also probed with the samples ((-) Control). Serum was pooled from all fish sampled on each date. Fish were held in freshwater and therefore were AGD-naïve. _____ 103

Figure 4.8 Anti-*r22C03* antibodies produced in serum and mucus of immunised Atlantic salmon bind to a cell surface antigen on fixed *Neoparamoeba perurans* trophozoites. *N. perurans* clone 4 trophozoites were fixed and probed with positive salmon serum sampled 8 weeks after immunisation (A and C), with positive skin mucus sampled 4 weeks post immunisation (E and G), negative salmon serum (B and D) and negative skin mucus (F and H) collected from salmon before immunisation. Serum from Southern bluefin tuna (*Thunnus macoyii*) was used as an isotype control (I and K). Cells probed with only PBS (J and L) were used as negative and background control. Positive salmon serum

was pooled from 5 fish immunised with *r22C03* 8 weeks prior. Positive skin mucus pooled from 5 fish sampled 4 weeks after immunisation with *r22C03*. Negative serum and skin mucus was obtained from 5 salmon before immunised. All salmon were maintained in freshwater and were therefore AGD-naïve. Scale = 50 µm. _____ 105

Figure 5.1 Antibody levels (units) in serum, mucus, gill and skin explant of Atlantic salmon against the recombinant protein *r22C03*, before challenge with *Neoparamoeba perurans*. Fish in groups RP and mRP had been immunised with *r22C03* at week 0 and given a booster at week 5. Tables show statistical differences between the vaccinated groups (RP and mRP) and their respective controls for each time point. Groups are identified as: Initial (*), RP (●); ADJ (■), BF (▲), mRP (○), mADJ (□) and mBF (Δ). Symbols represent values for individual fish, bars represent averages for each group. n=4 for each treatment at each time point. *=*P* between 0.05 and 0.01, **= *P*<0.01 by a one-way ANOVA. _____ 124

Figure 5.2 Antibody levels (units) in serum, mucus, gill and skin explant of Atlantic salmon against the recombinant protein *r22C03*, after the second challenge with *Neoparamoeba perurans*. Fish in groups RP and mRP had been immunised with *r22C03* 29 weeks prior and given a booster at 24 weeks earlier than sampling. Different letters represent statistical differences between the vaccinated groups (RP and mRP) and with their respective controls by a one-way ANOVA. Symbols represent values for individual fish; bars represent averages for each group. _____ 126

Figure 5.3 Percent survival for Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) vaccinated with *r22C03* after infection with *Neoparamoeba perurans*, in challenged tanks (A) or in a non-infection control tank (B). Fish in groups RP and mRP had been immunised with *r22C03* 21 weeks prior and given a booster at 16 weeks before the challenge. _____ 128

Figure 5.4 Percentage of affected filaments (A), average size of AGD lesions in affected filaments (B) and correlation between these two variables (C) in gills of surviving Atlantic salmon from different vaccination treatments and controls, 58

d after the second infection with *N. perurans*. Symbols represent values for individual fish; bars represent averages for each group. _____ 130

Figure 6.1 Protein extractions from Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) gill mucus resolved by Bis-Tris 4-12% NuPAGE® Novex® Mini gel and silver stained. Each lane contains a similar amount of protein yield (~ 6 µg per lane), after dialysis and lyophilisation. Lane 1 MWM, lanes 2-6: gill mucus samples from AGD-naïve fish, lanes 7-10: gill mucus from AGD-affected fish. Stars (★) indicate bands that were excised and subjected to in-gel digestion for identification by nanoLC-MS/MS. _____ 149

Figure 6.2 Principal component analysis of the full set of proteins identified at a high confidence level (≥ 2 peptides) in the biological replicates (n=5) of gill (A) and skin (B) mucus of Atlantic salmon. The blue dots denote the AGD naïve fish and the red dots represent AGD-affected fish. _____ 151

Supplementary Figure 6.3 Ingenuity pathway of three proteins networks identified during the experiment in gill mucus of Atlantic salmon affected by AGD, one in main image and two in the inset (one in grey, one in purple). Each gene involved in the pathway is denoted by their ENTREZ gene symbol or in some cases full gene name. The proteins indicated in coloured circles showed statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) differential expression by beta-binomial distribution analysis in R (red denotes over expressed, while green denotes under expressed). Figures in white indicate other proteins involved in the pathway. Solid arrows indicate direct protein interactions and dashed arrows indicate indirect protein interactions. Pathway analysis was done based on the mammalian orthologues of the proteins identified. _____ 159

Supplementary Figure 6.4 Two ingenuity pathways of proteins identified during the experiment in skin mucus of Atlantic salmon affected by AGD. Each gene involved in the pathway is denoted by their ENTREZ gene symbol or in some cases full gene name. The proteins indicated in coloured circles showed statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) differential expression by beta-binomial distribution analysis in R (red denotes over expressed, while green denotes under expressed). Figures in white indicate other proteins involved in the

List of Figures

pathway. Solid arrows indicate direct protein interactions and dashed arrows indicate indirect protein interactions. Pathway analysis was done based on the mammalian orthologues of the proteins identified. _____ 160

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Different fish species and areas where AGD has been reported and <i>N. perurans</i> presence has been confirmed.	6
Table 1.2 Different vaccination approaches against AGD in Atlantic salmon.	20
Table 1.3 Criteria for potency testing of vaccines (elaborated by Amend [138]).	22
Table 2.1 Proximate composition of the four diets used to feed Atlantic salmon in Experiment 2.	32
Table 2.2 Oligonucleotide primers used in real-time qPCR experiments.	36
Table 2.3 Two-way ANOVA results for transcription of immune related genes of Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) from experiment 2, which tested the effects of immunostimulatory diets on responses to AGD. Values in bold show significant results ($P < 0.005$).	44
Table 3.1 Number (n) of Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) in each treatment group. Treatments included fish immunised via intraperitoneal injection with Freund's complete adjuvant (IP), peranal intubation with Freund's incomplete adjuvant (PA) or immersion of gills and cranial end of fish (GILLS) with fluorescein isothiocyanate conjugated with keyhole limpet haemocyanin (FITC) or with dinitrophenol conjugated with keyhole limpet (DNP). Controls were sham exposed through the same routes with phosphate buffered saline (PBS). Primary and booster immunisations were given at week 0 and week 4.	56
Table 3.2 Experimental design for immunisation of Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) with two different hapten-antigens conjugates: FITC-KLH and DNP-KLH.	58
Table 5.1 Timeline for immunisations, challenges and sample collection for the investigation of immunity and protection against AGD induced by recombinant protein <i>r22C03</i> .	115
Table 5.2 Experimental design for immunisations of Atlantic salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) with recombinant protein <i>r22C03</i> .	116
Table 5.3 Relative percent survival (RPS) in each vaccination treatment group at the end of the second AGD challenge.	129

List of Tables

Table 5.4 <i>Yersinia ruckeri</i> infection status ((+) = positive) in serum of moribund Atlantic salmon by real-time qPCR, before and after the second challenge with <i>Neoparamoeba perurans</i> . Salmon were subjected to different vaccination treatments with a recombinant protein before AGD challenge. _____	132
Table 5.5 Number (n) of surviving Atlantic salmon and their <i>Yersinia ruckeri</i> infection status ((+) = positive or (-) = negative) detected by real-time qPCR in serum, at the end of the second challenge with <i>Neoparamoeba perurans</i> 58 d post-infection. Salmon were subjected to different vaccination treatments with a recombinant protein before AGD challenge. A negative AGD challenge control was located in a different uninfected tank. _____	133
Table 6.1 Proteins significantly and differentially abundant in gill mucus of AGD-affected Atlantic salmon. Proteins were identified by nanoLC-MS/MS. Proteins with $P < 0.05$ and fold change > 2.0 are in bold letters. SpC C, Spectral count control group; SpC D, spectral count diseased (AGD) group; FC, Fold change. _____	152
Supplementary Table 6.2 Proteins significantly and differentially abundant in skin mucus of AGD-affected Atlantic salmon. Proteins were identified by nanoLC-MS/MS. Proteins with $P < 0.05$ and fold change > 2.0 are in bold letters. SpC C, Spectral count control group; SpC D, spectral count diseased (AGD) group; FC, Fold change. _____	155
Table 7.1 Systemic and mucosal antibody responses in Atlantic salmon against whole cells of <i>N. perurans</i> or against particular antigens of the parasite, following AGD challenge only or vaccination and challenge. _____	170
Table 7.2 <i>Neoparamoeba perurans</i> dose, number and time of infections used in the present project. _____	179

ABBREVIATIONS

2-D	two dimensional
AGD	amoebic gill disease
ANOVA	analysis of variance
ASC	antibody secreting cell
BCA	bicinchoninic acid
BLAST	basic local alignment search tool
bp	base pair
BSA	bovine serum albumin
b.w.	body weight
CTL	cytotoxic T lymphocyte
d	day
df	degrees of freedom
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid
DNP	dinitrophenol
ELISA	enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay
FCA	Freund's complete adjuvant
FIA	Freund's incomplete adjuvant
FITC	fluorescein isothiocyanate
G	gauge
<i>g</i>	gravity
g	gram
h	hour
HRP	horseradish peroxidase
HSWB	high salt wash buffer
ICC	immunocytochemistry
IgG	immunoglobulin G
IgM	immunoglobulin M
IgT	immunoglobulin T
i.p.	intraperitoneal
kDa	kilodalton
KLH	keyhole limpet haemocyanin
L	litre
L-15	L-15 Medium (Leibovitz) for cell culture
LB	Luria Bertani media
LC MS/MS	liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry
LSWB	low salt wash buffer
M	mol
mAb	monoclonal antibody
MBP	mannose-binding protein
mg	milligram
MHC	Major histocompatibility complex
min	minute
mL	millilitre
mm	millimetre
mM	micromole
mRNA	messenger ribonucleic acid

Abbreviations

n	number of samples
nm	nanometer
NAPS	nucleic acid preservation solution
NCBI	National Centre for Biotechnology Information
NCMCRS	National Centre for Marine Conservation and Resource Sustainability
OD	optical density
OIE	World Organization for Animal Health
p.a.	peranal
PAMP	pathogen associated molecular pattern
PBS	phosphate-buffered saline
PCR	polymerase chain reaction
PRR	pattern recognition receptor
PSN	penicillin – streptomycin – neomycin
PVDF	polyvinylidene difluoride
s	second
SD	standard deviation
SDS-PAGE	sodium dodecyl sulphate - polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
SE	standard error
<i>r</i>	recombinant
RNA	ribonucleic acid
rpm	revolutions per minute
RT	room temperature
TBS	tris-buffered saline
TLR	Toll- like receptor
TMB	3,3',5,5'-tetramethyl benzidine
V	Volts
W	Watts
WB	western blot
x	times
µm	micrometre
µL	microlitre

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Amoebic gill disease (AGD) is the main disease affecting the Tasmanian salmonid industry and the condition has also been described in other major salmon and trout producing countries. AGD is caused by *Neoparamoeba perurans*, and outbreaks of the disease appear during the marine grow-out phase, in particular when water temperature rises. Some characterisation of the host immune response against the parasite has been achieved through gene expression studies and through others investigations which focused on antibody responses against *N. perurans*, particularly IgM. A variety of treatments have been tested, but currently the only treatment option widely used in Tasmania is freshwater bathing, which represent a high economic burden for the industry. Therefore, the development of a vaccine remains a high priority for salmon producers and different types of vaccines have been previously tested against AGD without success.

In order to develop a potentially successful vaccine strategy, a better understanding of the antibody immune response associated with the disease is necessary. To address this general objective, the followings aims were studied in this thesis:

- Investigate the mucosal and systemic immune response of Atlantic salmon against *N. perurans*, the causative agent of AGD.
- Investigate mucosal and systemic anti-*N. perurans* antibody responses to a recombinant putative attachment protein of the amoeba, first identified by the generation of a cDNA library from the parasite.
- Investigate vaccine formulations for AGD, using the recombinant protein described above.
- Investigate other mucosal components potentially involved in the host response against *N. perurans*.

This thesis presents the results obtained from several different experiments aimed at addressing the above stated aims. Firstly, an experiment where the immune responses of Atlantic salmon were assessed at transcription and antibody production levels, after repeated infections with *N. perurans*. Secondly, an experiment where immune responses were assessed after a single infection and fish were fed commercially

developed diets containing immunostimulants. We showed that antibody levels do not always correlate with mRNA transcription levels identified in AGD gill lesions, which is possibly explained by weak correlations existing between protein and mRNA abundances in cells and tissues. Additionally, we demonstrated that the use of immunostimulants containing diets did not affect the levels of serum or skin mucus IgM and were unable to induce IgM and IgT transcription at the site of AGD infection.

Following from this experiment; the systemic and mucosal immune responses of Atlantic salmon were studied using two protein-hapten antigens. This study aimed at evaluating the best delivery method of antigens to be used in the testing of a vaccine candidate in subsequent experiments. The results showed that i.p. injection of immunogens emulsified in FCA was the best delivery method for inducing systemic and mucosal antibody responses.

We described the production of a recombinant protein named *r22C03*, identified as a mannose-binding protein-like (MBP-like) similar to attachment factors of other amoebae, and a putative attachment factor of *N. perurans*. This protein was capable of inducing systemic and mucosal antibody responses against the amoebae and both systemic and mucosal antibodies produced were able to bind the surface of formalin-fixed *N. perurans*. The recombinant protein was then tested as a vaccine candidate against AGD, following the rationale that by using functional antibodies present in mucosal surfaces, the putative attachment factor of *N. perurans* might be blocked and the severity of AGD could potentially be reduced. Fish were immunised with *r22C03* using two different vaccination strategies and then challenged with the parasite. A strong antibody response against the recombinant protein was observed in serum and mucosal surfaces of vaccinated salmon, but no differences in survival curves or size of lesion in the gills were observed. However, a concurrent infection with *Yersinia ruckeri* was present during the experiment, and even though the simultaneous presentation of both pathogens could represent a situation more closely related to infection patterns observed on commercial farms, survival results obtained after the parasite challenge had to be examined with caution in the context of vaccine efficacy against *N. perurans*.

Executive Summary

Following from the unsuccessful challenge, nanoLC-MS/MS and proteomics analyses were used on skin and gill mucus of AGD-affected fish, as a tool to identify the changes in the proteome of mucus after repeated infection with amoebae. Proteins that have been previously related to gene expression in AGD-affected gills as well as proteins that have not been previously described in AGD-affected fish were identified and it was proposed that future research should focus on better understanding the role these components play in the response against infection with *N. perurans*.

This thesis provided further understanding into the mucosal responses to AGD. However, the role mucosal antibodies play in responses against AGD cannot be completely comprehended until the study of IgT responses in AGD-affected fish can be completed, as it has been hampered by the lack of available reagents. Finally, adjuvants that have been designed specifically to elicit mucosal responses need to be fully tested in AGD vaccine formulations.